

REMARKS

The objection to the ABSTRACT of September 23, 2005, as too short cannot be understood, because it is between 50 and 150 narrative words. Nevertheless, a new ABSTRACT based on claim 10 is above.

The rejection of claims 10 and 12 - 17 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited Snyder patent is based on finding coil spring 50 of the patent the same as the elastic element (e.g., 302) of claim 10, but this is not the case.

Paragraph [0022], lines 8-11, of the specification describes:

A first terminal of the elastic element 302 is installed into a second interior surface 3014 of the casing 301, and a second terminal of the elastic element 302 is connected to the cable body. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the second terminal of the elastic element 302 hooks the cable 201.

Accordingly, one end of the elastic element 302 connects the second interior surface 3014 (not the detents 46 in the'635 reference), and another end connects to the cable 201 (not the mouse cord 22 in the'635 reference).

Column 4, lines 7-11, describes:

a base piece 47;opposed detents 46 and 48 projecting, respectively, from the lever and the base piece; and, coil spring 50, mounted endwise over each of the detents, biasing the pawl lever outward of the ratchet wheel 38.

This shows that one end of the coil spring 50 connects to the detents 46 and the other end connects to detents 48 and base piece 47. Clearly, the detents 48, the base piece 47 and the detents 46 are all the same stop device shown in the Fig.5.

Besides, the coil spring 50 of the Snyder patent is to control the arresting motion for detents 46, and to further control the moving around of the wheel 38 by the detent 46 so as to

drive the rolling up of the mouse cord 22; whereas, the claimed elastic element is "... to force the signal-transmission device to draw back into the collecting portion." Therefore, it is obvious that the elastic element (e.g., 302) of claim 10 is different from coil spring 50 of the Snyder patent in both structural connection and purpose, and not similar, as required for rejection.

Then, too, the second interior surface 3014 in our specification is a fixed base to bring the support force to the elastic element 302. But the detents 46 in the Snyder patent (shown in the Fig.5) are only to produce arresting work for tooth structure of the wheel 38. It is obvious that the second interior surface 3014 of our specification and the cited detents are also different.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. In view of the above-mentioned facts, Applicant submits that the Snyder patent does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 10 nor, therefore, its dependent claims, whereby it cannot anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930